UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA JAMES EBRAHIMI, Plaintiff(s), CCW LANTANA, LLC, et al., Defendant(s). Pending before the Court is the parties' stipulated discovery plan and scheduling order. Docket No. 7. The parties' discovery plan requests a 365-day discovery period. Id. at 2. The presumptively reasonable discovery period is 180 days calculated from the first defendant's appearance. Local Rule 26-1(b)(1). The parties request special scheduling review based on the procedural history and Plaintiff's ongoing treatment. Docket No. 7 at 2. The parties fail to show that a 365-day discovery period is necessary and the parties fail to state what discovery, if any, was completed while this case was pending in state court. Further, the parties' plan, on its face, fails to state, "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED." See Local Rule 26-1(a). Accordingly, the discovery plan no later than May 28, 2019. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: May 22, 2019 Nancy J. Koppe United States-Maevistrate Judge			
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA JAMES EBRAHIMI, Plaintiff(s), V. CCW LANTANA, LLC, et al., Defendant(s). Pending before the Court is the parties' stipulated discovery plan and scheduling order. Docket No. 7. The parties' discovery plan requests a 365-day discovery period. Id. at 2. The presumptively reasonable discovery period is 180 days calculated from the first defendant's appearance. Local Rule 26-1(b)(1). The parties request special scheduling review based on the procedural history and Plaintiff's ongoing treatment. Docket No. 7 at 2. The parties fail to show that a 365-day discovery period is necessary and the parties fail to state what discovery, if any, was completed while this case was pending in state court. Further, the parties' plan, on its face, fails to state, "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED." See Local Rule 26-1(a). Accordingly, the discovery plan is DENIED without prejudice. The parties shall file a renewed joint proposed discovery plan no later than May 28, 2019. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: May 22, 2019	1		
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA JAMES EBRAHIMI, Plaintiff(s), V. CCW LANTANA, LLC, et al., Defendant(s). Pending before the Court is the parties' stipulated discovery plan and scheduling order. Docket No. 7. The parties' discovery plan requests a 365-day discovery period. Id. at 2. The presumptively reasonable discovery period is 180 days calculated from the first defendant's appearance. Local Rule 26-1(b)(1). The parties request special scheduling review based on the procedural history and Plaintiff's ongoing treatment. Docket No. 7 at 2. The parties fail to show that a 365-day discovery period is necessary and the parties fail to state what discovery, if any, was completed while this case was pending in state court. Further, the parties' plan, on its face, fails to state, "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED." See Local Rule 26-1(a). Accordingly, the discovery plan is DENIED without prejudice. The parties shall file a renewed joint proposed discovery plan no later than May 28, 2019. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: May 22, 2019	2		
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA JAMES EBRAHIMI, Plaintiff(s), V. CCW LANTANA, LLC, et al., Defendant(s). Pending before the Court is the parties' stipulated discovery plan and scheduling order. Docket No. 7. The parties' discovery plan requests a 365-day discovery period. Id. at 2. The presumptively reasonable discovery period is 180 days calculated from the first defendant's appearance. Local Rule 26-1(b)(1). The parties request special scheduling review based on the procedural history and Plaintiff's ongoing treatment. Docket No. 7 at 2. The parties fail to show that a 365-day discovery period is necessary and the parties fail to state what discovery, if any, was completed while this case was pending in state court. Further, the parties' plan, on its face, fails to state, "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED." See Local Rule 26-1(a). Accordingly, the discovery plan is DENIED without prejudice. The parties shall file a renewed joint proposed discovery plan no later than May 28, 2019. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: May 22, 2019	3		
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA JAMES EBRAHIMI, Plaintiff(s), V. CCW LANTANA, LLC, et al., Defendant(s). Pending before the Court is the parties' stipulated discovery plan and scheduling order. Docket No. 7. The parties' discovery plan requests a 365-day discovery period. Id. at 2. The presumptively reasonable discovery period is 180 days calculated from the first defendant's appearance. Local Rule 26-1(b)(1). The parties request special scheduling review based on the procedural history and Plaintiff's ongoing treatment. Docket No. 7 at 2. The parties fail to show that a 365-day discovery period is necessary and the parties fail to state what discovery, if any, was completed while this case was pending in state court. Further, the parties' plan, on its face, fails to state, "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED." See Local Rule 26-1(a). Accordingly, the discovery plan no later than May 28, 2019. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: May 22, 2019 Nancy J. Koppe	4		
DISTRICT OF NEVADA JAMES EBRAHIMI, Plaintiff(s), V. CCW LANTANA, LLC, et al., Defendant(s). Pending before the Court is the parties' stipulated discovery plan and scheduling order. Docket No. 7. The parties' discovery plan requests a 365-day discovery period. Id. at 2. The presumptively reasonable discovery period is 180 days calculated from the first defendant's appearance. Local Rule 26-1(b)(1). The parties request special scheduling review based on the procedural history and Plaintiff's ongoing treatment. Docket No. 7 at 2. The parties fail to show that a 365-day discovery period is necessary and the parties fail to state what discovery, if any, was completed while this case was pending in state court. Further, the parties' plan, on its face, fails to state, "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED." See Local Rule 26-1(a). Accordingly, the discovery plan no later than May 28, 2019. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: May 22, 2019 Nancy J. Koppe	5		
JAMES EBRAHIMI, Plaintiff(s), V. CCW LANTANA, LLC, et al., Defendant(s). Pending before the Court is the parties' stipulated discovery plan and scheduling order. Docket No. 7. The parties' discovery plan requests a 365-day discovery period. Id. at 2. The presumptively reasonable discovery period is 180 days calculated from the first defendant's appearance. Local Rule 26-1(b)(1). The parties request special scheduling review based on the procedural history and Plaintiff's ongoing treatment. Docket No. 7 at 2. The parties fail to show that a 365-day discovery period is necessary and the parties fail to state what discovery, if any, was completed while this case was pending in state court. Further, the parties' plan, on its face, fails to state, "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED." See Local Rule 26-1(a). Accordingly, the discovery plan no later than May 28, 2019. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: May 22, 2019 Nancy J. Koppe	6	IINITED STATES I	DISTRICT COLIRT
JAMES EBRAHIMI, Plaintiff(s), V. CCW LANTANA, LLC, et al., Defendant(s). Pending before the Court is the parties' stipulated discovery plan and scheduling order. Docket No. 7. The parties' discovery plan requests a 365-day discovery period. Id. at 2. The presumptively reasonable discovery period is 180 days calculated from the first defendant's appearance. Local Rule 26-1(b)(1). The parties request special scheduling review based on the procedural history and Plaintiff's ongoing treatment. Docket No. 7 at 2. The parties fail to show that a 365-day discovery period is necessary and the parties fail to state what discovery, if any, was completed while this case was pending in state court. Further, the parties' plan, on its face, fails to state, "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED." See Local Rule 26-1(a). Accordingly, the discovery plan is DENIED without prejudice. The parties shall file a renewed joint proposed discovery plan no later than May 28, 2019. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: May 22, 2019 Nancy J. Koppe	7		
JAMES EBRAHIMI, Plaintiff(s), V. CCW LANTANA, LLC, et al., Defendant(s). Pending before the Court is the parties' stipulated discovery plan and scheduling order. Docket No. 7. The parties' discovery plan requests a 365-day discovery period. Id. at 2. The presumptively reasonable discovery period is 180 days calculated from the first defendant's appearance. Local Rule 26-1(b)(1). The parties request special scheduling review based on the procedural history and Plaintiff's ongoing treatment. Docket No. 7 at 2. The parties fail to show that a 365-day discovery period is necessary and the parties fail to state what discovery, if any, was completed while this case was pending in state court. Further, the parties' plan, on its face, fails to state, "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED." See Local Rule 26-1(a). Accordingly, the discovery plan no later than May 28, 2019. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: May 22, 2019 Nancy J. Koppe	8	DISTRICT OF INDIVIDIN	
Plaintiff(s), V. (Docket No. 7) CCW LANTANA, LLC, et al., Defendant(s). Pending before the Court is the parties' stipulated discovery plan and scheduling order. Docket No. 7. The parties' discovery plan requests a 365-day discovery period. Id. at 2. The presumptively reasonable discovery period is 180 days calculated from the first defendant's appearance. Local Rule 26-1(b)(1). The parties request special scheduling review based on the procedural history and Plaintiff's ongoing treatment. Docket No. 7 at 2. The parties fail to show that a 365-day discovery period is necessary and the parties fail to state what discovery, if any, was completed while this case was pending in state court. Further, the parties' plan, on its face, fails to state, "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED." See Local Rule 26-1(a). Accordingly, the discovery plan no later than May 28, 2019. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: May 22, 2019 Nancy J. Koppe	9	IAMES ERRAHIMI	Case No : 2:19-cy-00325-ICM-NIK
V. (Docket No. 7) CCW LANTANA, LLC, et al., Defendant(s). Pending before the Court is the parties' stipulated discovery plan and scheduling order. Docket No. 7. The parties' discovery plan requests a 365-day discovery period. Id. at 2. The presumptively reasonable discovery period is 180 days calculated from the first defendant's appearance. Local Rule 26-1(b)(1). The parties request special scheduling review based on the procedural history and Plaintiff's ongoing treatment. Docket No. 7 at 2. The parties fail to show that a 365-day discovery period is necessary and the parties fail to state what discovery, if any, was completed while this case was pending in state court. Further, the parties' plan, on its face, fails to state, "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED." See Local Rule 26-1(a). Accordingly, the discovery plan is DENIED without prejudice. The parties shall file a renewed joint proposed discovery plan no later than May 28, 2019. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: May 22, 2019 Nancy J. Koppe	10	,	
CCW LANTANA, LLC, et al., Defendant(s). Pending before the Court is the parties' stipulated discovery plan and scheduling order. Docket No. 7. The parties' discovery plan requests a 365-day discovery period. Id. at 2. The presumptively reasonable discovery period is 180 days calculated from the first defendant's appearance. Local Rule 26-1(b)(1). The parties request special scheduling review based on the procedural history and Plaintiff's ongoing treatment. Docket No. 7 at 2. The parties fail to show that a 365-day discovery period is necessary and the parties fail to state what discovery, if any, was completed while this case was pending in state court. Further, the parties' plan, on its face, fails to state, "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED." See Local Rule 26-1(a). Accordingly, the discovery plan is DENIED without prejudice. The parties shall file a renewed joint proposed discovery plan no later than May 28, 2019. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: May 22, 2019	11	• • •	
Defendant(s). Pending before the Court is the parties' stipulated discovery plan and scheduling order. Docket No. 7. The parties' discovery plan requests a 365-day discovery period. <i>Id.</i> at 2. The presumptively reasonable discovery period is 180 days calculated from the first defendant's appearance. Local Rule 26-1(b)(1). The parties request special scheduling review based on the procedural history and Plaintiff's ongoing treatment. Docket No. 7 at 2. The parties fail to show that a 365-day discovery period is necessary and the parties fail to state what discovery, if any, was completed while this case was pending in state court. Further, the parties' plan, on its face, fails to state, "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED." <i>See</i> Local Rule 26-1(a). Accordingly, the discovery plan is DENIED without prejudice. The parties shall file a renewed joint proposed discovery plan no later than May 28, 2019. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: May 22, 2019 Nancy J. Koppe	12		(Docket No. 7)
Pending before the Court is the parties' stipulated discovery plan and scheduling order. Docket No. 7. The parties' discovery plan requests a 365-day discovery period. <i>Id.</i> at 2. The presumptively reasonable discovery period is 180 days calculated from the first defendant's appearance. Local Rule 26-1(b)(1). The parties request special scheduling review based on the procedural history and Plaintiff's ongoing treatment. Docket No. 7 at 2. The parties fail to show that a 365-day discovery period is necessary and the parties fail to state what discovery, if any, was completed while this case was pending in state court. Further, the parties' plan, on its face, fails to state, "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED." <i>See</i> Local Rule 26-1(a). Accordingly, the discovery plan is DENIED without prejudice. The parties shall file a renewed joint proposed discovery plan no later than May 28, 2019. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: May 22, 2019 Nancy J. Koppe	13		
Docket No. 7. The parties' discovery plan requests a 365-day discovery period. <i>Id.</i> at 2. The presumptively reasonable discovery period is 180 days calculated from the first defendant's appearance. Local Rule 26-1(b)(1). The parties request special scheduling review based on the procedural history and Plaintiff's ongoing treatment. Docket No. 7 at 2. The parties fail to show that a 365-day discovery period is necessary and the parties fail to state what discovery, if any, was completed while this case was pending in state court. Further, the parties' plan, on its face, fails to state, "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED." <i>See</i> Local Rule 26-1(a). Accordingly, the discovery plan is DENIED without prejudice. The parties shall file a renewed joint proposed discovery plan no later than May 28, 2019. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: May 22, 2019	14	Detendant(s).	
The presumptively reasonable discovery period is 180 days calculated from the first defendant's appearance. Local Rule 26-1(b)(1). The parties request special scheduling review based on the procedural history and Plaintiff's ongoing treatment. Docket No. 7 at 2. The parties fail to show that a 365-day discovery period is necessary and the parties fail to state what discovery, if any, was completed while this case was pending in state court. Further, the parties' plan, on its face, fails to state, "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED." <i>See</i> Local Rule 26-1(a). Accordingly, the discovery plan is DENIED without prejudice. The parties shall file a renewed joint proposed discovery plan no later than May 28, 2019. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: May 22, 2019	15	Pending before the Court is the parties' stipulated discovery plan and scheduling order.	
defendant's appearance. Local Rule 26-1(b)(1). The parties request special scheduling review based on the procedural history and Plaintiff's ongoing treatment. Docket No. 7 at 2. The parties fail to show that a 365-day discovery period is necessary and the parties fail to state what discovery, if any, was completed while this case was pending in state court. Further, the parties' plan, on its face, fails to state, "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED." <i>See</i> Local Rule 26-1(a). Accordingly, the discovery plan is DENIED without prejudice. The parties shall file a renewed joint proposed discovery plan no later than May 28, 2019. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: May 22, 2019 Nancy J. Koppe	16	Docket No. 7. The parties' discovery plan requests a 365-day discovery period. <i>Id.</i> at 2.	
based on the procedural history and Plaintiff's ongoing treatment. Docket No. 7 at 2. The parties fail to show that a 365-day discovery period is necessary and the parties fail to state what discovery, if any, was completed while this case was pending in state court. Further, the parties' plan, on its face, fails to state, "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED." <i>See</i> Local Rule 26-1(a). Accordingly, the discovery plan is DENIED without prejudice. The parties shall file a renewed joint proposed discovery plan no later than May 28, 2019. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: May 22, 2019	17	The presumptively reasonable discovery period is 180 days calculated from the first	
fail to show that a 365-day discovery period is necessary and the parties fail to state what discovery, if any, was completed while this case was pending in state court. Further, the parties' plan, on its face, fails to state, "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED." <i>See</i> Local Rule 26-1(a). Accordingly, the discovery plan is DENIED without prejudice. The parties shall file a renewed joint proposed discovery plan no later than May 28, 2019. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: May 22, 2019 Nancy J. Koppe	18	defendant's appearance. Local Rule 26-1(b)(1). The parties request special scheduling review	
if any, was completed while this case was pending in state court. Further, the parties' plan, on its face, fails to state, "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED." <i>See</i> Local Rule 26-1(a). Accordingly, the discovery plan is DENIED without prejudice. The parties shall file a renewed joint proposed discovery plan no later than May 28, 2019. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: May 22, 2019 Nancy J. Koppe	19	based on the procedural history and Plaintiff's ongoing treatment. Docket No. 7 at 2. The parties	
face, fails to state, "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED." See Local Rule 26-1(a). Accordingly, the discovery plan is DENIED without prejudice. The parties shall file a renewed joint proposed discovery plan no later than May 28, 2019. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: May 22, 2019 Nancy J. Koppe	20	fail to show that a 365-day discovery period is necessary and the parties fail to state what discovery,	
Accordingly, the discovery plan is DENIED without prejudice. The parties shall file a renewed joint proposed discovery plan no later than May 28, 2019. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: May 22, 2019 Nancy J. Koppe	21	if any, was completed while this case was pending in state court. Further, the parties' plan, on its	
joint proposed discovery plan no later than May 28, 2019. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: May 22, 2019 Nancy J. Koppe	22	face, fails to state, "SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED." See Local Rule 26-1(a).	
25 IT IS SO ORDERED. 26 Dated: May 22, 2019 27 Nancy J. Koppe	23	Accordingly, the discovery plan is DENIED without prejudice. The parties shall file a renewed	
26 Dated: May 22, 2019 27 Nancy J. Koppe	24	joint proposed discovery plan no later than May 28, 2019.	
Nancy J. Koppe	25	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
Nancy J. Koppe	26	Dated: May 22, 2019	.1
	27		Nanay I Vanas
Cinica States Final States	28		United States Magistrate Judge